

program instructing a computer to perform:

storing a plurality of fixed form reply sets, each fixed form reply set containing a plurality of replies;

storing a message separately from the fixed form reply sets;

receiving [a] the message from a host;

selecting a fixed form reply set;

allowing a user to choose a reply from the selected fixed form reply set;

sending the chosen reply to the host; and

computing the frequency of chosen replies sent to the host.

REMARKS

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-25 are pending.

In view of the above, it is submitted that claims 1-25 are pending herein for consideration.

II. INTERVIEW HELD ON NOVEMBER 14, 2000

The Applicant once again wishes to thank the Examiner for his time in granting the November 14 interview. The amendments and remarks presented herein reflect what was discussed at the interview.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-4, 6-22 and 24-25 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Page 2 of the Office Action rejects claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Peter et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,893,098 (Hereinafter "Peters").

Claim 1 is amended to recite, "storage means for storing data for a fixed form reply, stored separately from the message . . ."

As discussed during the personal interview, in Peter the message and the reply data are integrated. As stated in the previously filed Amendment, the present system is advantageous over

systems like Peter in that storing the reply data and the message data integrated as in Peter means that questions have to be created for each message.

Therefore, claim 1 (as amended) cannot be anticipated by Peter.

The remaining independent claims are amended similarly to claim 1, and therefore also cannot be anticipated by Peter.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, as well as the discussion during the personal interview, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 5 AND 23 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Page 13 of the Office Action rejects claims 5 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Peters in view of Ginter et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,982,891 (Hereinafter "Ginter").

Claims 5 and 23 are dependent upon claims 1 and 21, which for the reasons set forth in section III of this Amendment should be allowed over the prior art. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 5 and 23 is respectfully requested.


V. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If any further fees are required by the submission of this Amendment, please charge same to deposit account no. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY



Jon H. Muskin
Registration No. 43,824

Dated: W-19-00
700 Eleventh Street, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 434-1500